

In 2007, the Supreme Court issued the *Massachusetts v. EPA* decision, directing the EPA to examine greenhouse gas emissions and their impact on the public health. EPA conducted a highly credible, peer-reviewed scientific analysis under the Bush EPA and the Obama EPA, both concluding that greenhouse gases harm our health.

This was not a political analysis; it was a scientific analysis. But that has not stopped the chairman from trying to legislatively undermine scientific fact. According to the EPA, President Nixon's Clean Air Act will prevent 230,000 premature deaths and result in \$2 trillion in economic benefits in 2020.

But, Chairman UPTON has decided, with much help from corporate polluters' lobbyists, that the fiscal and physical well-being of the American people are less important than Big Oil's importance and Big Oil's billion dollar bottom line next quarter.

The bottom line for America is that undermining EPA science will cost trillions.

PAIN AT THE PUMP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. NUNNELEE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. NUNNELEE. Mr. Speaker, frustrations are growing as Americans are feeling real pain at the pumps. The rising gas prices are a serious strain on an economy that is beginning to show small signs of recovery.

Right now, the average gas price in Mississippi is \$3.50 a gallon, and I don't think anybody would be surprised if that number continues to rise. Every time gas prices go up by one penny, that costs American consumers \$4 million a day.

Families in north Mississippi have been dealing with tight budgets for the last couple of years, and rising gas prices severely impact an already tightened family budget. We all know that ultimately gas prices will be passed on in higher prices to the consumer through higher transportation costs, increased costs of groceries and other commodities. When there is no extra money in the pocketbooks, there is certainly no padding in the family budget to accommodate this increase in the cost of living associated with higher gas prices.

As turmoil in the Middle East continues, coupled with emerging demand for Third World developing countries that places demand on foreign energy demands, that's going to cause gas prices to further increase. This problem is serious, and it needs to be addressed now. It needs to be addressed through exploring more domestic energy production.

However, President Obama has offered a short-term solution, tapping into the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. The Strategic Petroleum Reserve is available for national emergencies at a time of crisis. Mississippians can all

agree that when President Bush tapped into the strategic reserve during the aftermath of Katrina, it was in response to a serious supply disruption and an unforeseeable disaster.

But if we draw down on these reserves when gas hits \$4 a gallon, what will we do if the reserves are depleted and then a real emergency hits? The President's shortsighted answer to our rapidly increasing oil and gas prices does nothing to protect America from future energy prices skyrocketing, nor does it help lead toward American energy independence.

From the beginning, the Obama administration has failed to initiate a serious energy policy. Instead, this administration has actively taken steps to block or delay American energy production, therefore making us more dependent on unstable foreign countries' oil production.

□ 1010

Recently, we remembered the 50th anniversary of President Kennedy's inauguration. Following that inauguration, the President stood in this very Chamber and challenged our Nation to make it a national goal to place a man on the Moon and return him safely back to Earth before the decade is out. Today, we should make it a national priority that before the end of this decade, the United States should achieve energy security and energy independence. By actively producing our own energy resources, America will not only be independent from volatile regions of the world, but we will supply our own energy.

Now there is no single "silver bullet" and Republicans support an all-of-the-above approach that includes more American oil, more American natural gas, coal and nuclear energy. We need to expand U.S. oil exploration immediately in the Gulf of Mexico and Alaska. The gulf produces nearly one-third of our domestic oil. Offshore natural gas produced in the gulf region accounts for 13 percent of the total U.S. production. However, a de facto moratorium still exists, even though the official moratorium was lifted last May and October.

Not only has the gulf lost 12,000 quality jobs because of the moratorium, but these rigs are actively leaving that region and moving to foreign countries such as Cuba, Brazil and Mexico.

In February, Federal Judge Feldman gave the Department of the Interior 30 days to rule on seven deepwater drilling permits. As of today, only one of those permits has been issued. That is simply inexcusable. This type of deliberate inaction and negligence fails to meet the needs of a struggling U.S. economy. That is why I'm a proud cosponsor of House Resolution 140, which calls for a streamlining of the permit process for shallow and deepwater drilling in the gulf.

In 2008, President Obama put the entire Pacific coast, Atlantic coast and the eastern gulf coast off-limits to fu-

ture energy production. This includes a large portion of Alaska's Outer Continental Shelf, even though expanding production would ultimately create upwards of 1.2 million jobs and generate \$8 trillion in economic output. That's why we must immediately begin a long-term energy policy and begin to drill today to deal with higher gas prices.

I also believe that it is vitally important to invest in the development of clean coal technologies. Coal is our Nation's most abundant and affordable energy resource, and another way to energy independence is through economically and environmentally sound clean coal technology. President Obama has specifically said that he would bankrupt the coal industry through regulations and impossible standards.

Democrats continue to operate an anti-business agenda and restrict the advancement of domestic energy development through regulations, moratoriums and increased taxes on American energy production. The President's 2012 budget includes over \$60 billion in tax and fee increases on American energy production. This will only add to the burden of families and businesses.

The current unrest in the Middle East only emphasizes the importance for America to develop more of its own domestic resources. American energy production can lower prices, create good jobs and decrease our reliability on foreign oil. We need to start paying Americans and stop funding our enemies.

Our country has been blessed with clean and efficient energy resources. Let's stop putting unreasonable restrictions on our natural resources and allow America to claim energy independence.

FORECLOSURE CRISIS AND GOP GUTTING FORECLOSURE PROGRAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU) for 5 minutes.

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, the effects of the foreclosure crisis and economic downturn have had a devastating impact on American families. Because of shoddy business practices and enormous risks taken by big banks, our housing and financial systems have utterly collapsed. And in the wake of this destruction, millions of Americans have lost their jobs, their homes and their quality of life.

As the casualties rose and homeowners clamored for some relief, the government stepped in to do what it could. But with the scope of the problem, government foreclosure relief programs alone just aren't enough. We should do more—more to fix the housing market and more especially to create jobs, because putting people back to work will do more to right our economy, help people pay their mortgages and get the banks back to lending than anything else.

But the Republican House leadership hasn't gotten the message. In the last 10 weeks since the Republicans took control of the House, they haven't created a single job. What's worse, they

haven't even put a single jobs bill on the House floor. Instead of creating jobs, they are slashing them. The GOP spending plan eliminates 700,000 jobs and stifles economic growth. Rather than moving the Nation forward, they are forcing America backward.

And this week is no different. Republicans are making things worse for American families as they continue their assault on the middle class. They want to completely abolish four programs designed to help homeowners keep their houses and avoid foreclosure. Republicans have no interest in making these programs work better for the American people. By offering nothing in their place, the GOP is simply abandoning hardworking homeowners who are underwater and struggling to find jobs to pay the bills.

Now, we all know that government foreclosure programs are not perfect. But why are we completely dismantling programs that have helped thousands of Americans stay in their homes? Though not perfect, why are we targeting the victims of the foreclosure and financial crises instead of helping them by fixing these programs?

There's a lot that we can do better without giving up on people like Francisco. Francisco is from Duarte in my district. After a year, he was underwater, and, at the height of the recession, he tried to modify his home loan. He visited his servicer and was pushed back and forth between customer representatives. After 2 years of fighting for help, he only had four pieces of mail from the lender to show for it. He was eventually denied the modification, and he can't even appeal the decision. And though we should be doing more to help him, the Republican plan of doing nothing means that he is completely out of luck.

Commonsense improvements can be made to make the government foreclosure program better, ones that could provide relief to Francisco. Take the Home Affordable Modification Program, or HAMP. Simple fixes like having a case manager assigned to each case will allow for better communication between the customer and the bank. If a customer is denied a loan modification, it would be more effective to appeal the decision instead of having to reapply all over again. And we can do more to provide incentives for banks to complete modifications and ensure that servicers complete due diligence before denying modifications.

These are reasonable solutions that servicers have been slow to adopt, if at all. And if we don't make changes to these programs and instead just throw them away, what will struggling homeowners be left with? They will be left to the banks whose bad policies caused this financial crisis in the first place. They will be left with unstable communities strewn with abandoned homes, and they will be left without a home and no one to turn to for help.

It sounds like Republicans would rather return to old policies that we

know don't work rather than trying to fix the policies we know that can work. Struggling Americans deserve better than that.

NO-FLY ZONE: A CHALLENGE TO THE WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. The important question being asked today with regards to foreign policy is should the United States impose a no-fly zone over Libya? There are leaders on both sides of the Capitol and leaders in both parties who are now advising this as well as individuals in the administration. It is my opinion that we should not. It would be foolish, it would have a downside, and we should think very, very carefully before we go expanding the wars that we're already involved in. We're in two major wars with Iraq and Afghanistan, and that involves Pakistan and Yemen already.

So to go into Libya now and impose a no-fly zone—we have to remember, a no-fly zone is an act of war. What moral right do we have to participate in war activity against Libya? Libya hasn't done anything to the United States. They're not a threat to our national security. There's been no aggression. There's no constitutional authority for a President to willy-nilly go and start placing no-fly zones over countries around the world.

We tried this in the 1990s and did it for 8 or 9 years. We had a no-fly zone, along with sanctions and blockades, around Iraq. Finally, it ended up with war. And the wars were based on lies. And then when that happened they said, yes, but it was well worth it because we got rid of a bad guy. But we also lost close to 4,500 American military people, 30-some thousand suffered severe injuries and hundreds of thousands are applying now for disability because we went to war when we shouldn't have gone to war.

To expand this war now makes no sense whatsoever. It's against international law. It challenges the War Powers Resolution. For that reason, we should stop and think. Congress should act. I'm preparing to introduce a resolution next week that it is the sense of Congress that the executive branch can't do this without approval from the Congress.

□ 1020

Why should we do this? Do you think it will cost some money? Yes, it is going to cost a ton of money. Innocent people will be killed. You can't just all of a sudden turn a switch and say don't fly over Libya; you have to bomb a lot of anti-aircraft sites and a lot of military establishments, so the war is on.

From my viewpoint, this is the kind of thing that has been going on too long. It contributes significantly to our bankruptcy, and we are now spending approximately \$1 trillion a year main-

taining our empire around the world. We are in the process of remaking all the borders and leadership in the Middle East and Central Asia, and now in North Africa we're getting involved. We have invested \$70 billion trying to prop up a dictator in Egypt, and look at how that ended up. Now we are hustling around to find out who the next dictator is.

So if we get involved, I'm not sure they even know who to bomb and which one and who is going to come out on top. That is an internal matter. It is a civil war that is going on. We can cheer for one side or the other, but that is not a justification to place the burden on the American people, both militarily and individually, as well as monetarily. Some would say yes, that sounds good, I agree, and as long as we get approval from the U.N. and NATO, it will be okay. But, you know, that is just really a cop-out. What army and air force and technology does the U.N. have, and what does NATO have? You get a resolution at the U.N. that says let's take out this bad guy and do these things, or NATO does it. They are all of our airplanes and all our money. And no matter what, anything and everything that goes wrong, the United States will be blamed for it. There is enough resentment against us already for pretending that we can tell every other country how to live.

The best way to look at this, I believe, is how would we as a people and how would we as a Congress respond if we were a weaker nation and there was a stronger nation, if they came and imposed a no-fly zone over us or had sanctions against us or had a blockade. We wouldn't accept that. That would unify us. So I don't buy into this thing that this is the only humanitarian thing we can do, expand the war.

If we want to do something for humanity, we need a new foreign policy. We need a foreign policy that isn't built on militarism; it's built on more cooperation and more trade and not picking our dictators.

Look at what happened after we picked a dictator for Iran. Sure, it lasted for 25 years or so. But eventually it radicalized the Islamists and they had a revolution, and we came out on the short end of that. So I think it is time that we reassess this and think about a policy that makes a lot more sense. Economically, we need to do it.

NUCLEAR WASTE AT YUCCA MOUNTAIN: OVER MY DEAD BODY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have been in Congress now for 12 years. The very first speech I made on the floor of the House was why nuclear waste should not be stored at Yucca Mountain, Nevada. I cannot believe 12 years from when I first made that speech, I am back in the well of the House talking about why Nevada should not be